



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

de Belges and Boccaccio: . . . *et luy fait pondre deux enfans*⁵² *à diverses fois: C'est-à-dire luy fait faire quatre enfans à deux portees: dont de lune nasquirent Castor et Pollux freres jumeaux: et de l'autre Heleine et Clytemnestre, sœurs jumelles selon l'opinion de Bocace.*⁵³

LUOY M. GAY.

University of Wisconsin.

Histoire illustrée de la littérature française, précis méthodique, par E. ABRY, C. AUDIC, P. CROUZET. Paris: Didier, 1912. xii + 664 pp.

MM. Abry, Audic, and Crouzet, teachers in French lycées, have produced an admirable manual of French literature. Their work has already begun to supersede a number of similar books at present in use in American high-schools and colleges, and fully deserves to do so. Dominated by the ideas of M. Lanson, it should occupy in the elementary teaching of French a position similar to that which the more profound and extensive work of the Professor of French literature at the Sorbonne holds in advanced and graduate work.

The authors describe their work as a "précis essentiellement réaliste." It has two distinctive characteristics, the substitution of historical for aesthetic criticism, and the systematic use of illustrations. MM. Abry, Audic, and Crouzet dispense with the subtle analyses of individual style and the elaborate comparisons of different writers which are common in literary histories, though of value chiefly to readers familiar with the authors discussed. They substitute information much more profitable to the students for whom the present hand-book is intended, abundant biographical details, brief but illuminating extracts and outlines, and helpful sketches of literary connections and historical background.

In analyzing literary traits and tendencies,

the authors attempt a purely objective treatment. In so doing they permit the skeleton of their work to obtrude itself upon the reader with somewhat excessive insistence. In discussing Alfred de Vigny, for example (pp. 514-5), they point out with all the emphasis of very black type that his character had *three* principal qualities: "1. La tristesse;" "2. L'orgueil;" "3. La pitié." Similarly, his literary theories are summarized under "1. L'impersonnalité," and "2. Le symbole." Under each of these headings extracts are given in illustration of the statements made. At first sight this system appears mechanical and dogmatic, but more careful examination shows that the context softens the harshness of the outline, and that the extracts lend it life and meaning. Upon the whole, though the attempt to abstain from aesthetic criticism has been carried out with some exaggeration, the step taken in this direction is distinctly to be commended.

Like a number of other text-books issued by the same publisher, the book is remarkable for the large number (324) and the excellence of its illustrations. M. Crouzet, who was responsible for this part of the book, gives evidence of taste and judgment. Though the small size of the reproductions makes them in some cases difficult to appreciate—the legends of M. Crouzet frequently call attention to details that are scarcely visible—yet the freshness, variety, and helpfulness of the pictures are worthy of all praise. A student who sees a page reproduced from Montaigne's printed copy of his *Essais*, with numerous manuscript corrections (p. 108), or from Racine's Greek text of Aeschylus, with careful annotations in Racine's own hand (p. 244), gains a definite and useful appreciation of the way in which the masterpieces of French literature developed. *Préciosité* and the funeral orations of Bossuet are brought measurably nearer to one who sees the *Carte du Tendre* (p. 136) and an excellent picture of the funeral of Henriette d'Angleterre (p. 260).

The taste of the writers of the history, to judge from their inclusions and exclusions as well as their characterizations, is in general very good. As is to be expected in a school book, certain sides of French literature are de-

⁵² The ms. of Geneva reads *eufz*; cf. *Œuvres de J. L. de B.*, p. p. J. Stecher, 1882, Vol. 2, p. 22.

⁵³ *Illustrations de la Gaule*, Bk. II, Ch. ii.

cidedly ignored; the extracts from Rabelais are all edifying, and one is amazed at the success of the authors in ferreting out so many unobjectionable *fabliaux* to present as specimens of the *genre*. A certain sympathy with the masses appears in the respectful treatment accorded the novels of Dumas père and in the mild strictures passed upon Coppée.

As in many histories of French literature, the weakest part of the book is that dealing with the middle ages. Here the chief drawback consists in embracing the whole period anterior to 1500 in one section, divided only according to literary species (epic, history, satire, etc.), so that no distinction is made in the mind of the student between the earlier and the later mediaeval period.

There are naturally many single points upon which one is minded to differ from MM. Abry, Audic, and Crouzet. It is surprising to hear nothing of *La belle dame sans merci* in connection with Alain Chartier. Du Bartas comes off rather ill, as usual; he is represented by a ridiculous passage, and nothing is said of Milton's indebtedness to him, though Goethe and Tasso are spoken of as admirers. No mention is made of Massillon's avoidance of dogma and consequent popularity with the eighteenth century *philosophes*. Great enthusiasm is displayed for the works of Victor Hugo, and mediaevalists may be surprised to hear the *Légende des Siècles* described as "notre plus grand poème épique" (p. 508). Sainte-Beuve the poet is spoken of as a precursor of Coppée alone (p. 530); mention of his influence upon Baudelaire also would have been appropriate. It seems strange to find a funeral discourse by Pasteur, inspired by deep feeling, cited (p. 590) as an example of the "style scientifique." Admirers of Daudet will hardly be satisfied with a treatment of his works which gives a place of honor to the uneven *Petit chose*, the melodramatic *Fromont jeune et Risler aîné*, and the insignificant *Sapho*, barely mentions *Jack* and *Le Nabab*, and says nothing whatever of *Numa Roumestan* and the short stories. The average American reader will probably criticize an apportionment of space which gives Huysmans one line (p. 627) and Fromentin a

whole page (pp. 621-22). English-speaking people would doubtless wish to see such writers as Joubert, Amiel, and Cherbuliez included among the authors discussed.

The relations of language and literature receive adequate and accurate treatment. *Vulpeculum* as the etymon of *goupil* (p. 30, n. 1) is probably a misprint. By an unfortunate oversight, all the words introduced into the language by the Pléiade, including such common words as *patrie* (? See Godefroy, *Comp.*, s. v.), *pudeur*, *police*, are described as adopted "sans discrétion ni méthode" from different languages. They are given (p. 115) under the heading "Les excès de la Pléiade" !

In discussing points relating to the part played by Frenchmen in the advancement of knowledge, the authors are occasionally a little chauvinistic. Guizot's *Histoire de la révolution d'Angleterre* is scarcely regarded as an authority in England nowadays (p. 576). Michelet is hardly the "inventor of true historical method" (p. 583). Fermat did not discover the differential calculus (p. 112); he "almost discovered" it (*Enc. Brit.*, 11th ed., xiv, 539, b). D'Alembert is not generally regarded as the first mathematician of his day (p. 308). Others shared with Buffon the honor of "creating" geology and paleontology (p. 310).

In regard to matters of fact a high standard of accuracy has been attained. The following points call for rectification; many of them are mere misprints. The *serventois* is hardly a simple "chanson badine" (p. 53). Guillaume de Machaut has found an editor in the person of Prof. Hoepffner (p. 54). Jean Lemaire de Belges is incorrectly called *des* Belges (pp. 60, 64); elsewhere (p. 81) the correct form occurs. Scaliger did not formulate the rule of the three unities in 1561 (p. 162); Castelvetro, the true author of the rule, so far as our knowledge at present goes, did not advance it until 1570. A letter of Madame de Maintenon (p. 189) is dated 1896 instead of 1686. M. Brunschvicg's name is spelt with a *w* on pp. 200, n. 1, and 206 (correctly on p. 204). Fénelon's name is de Salagnac and not Salagnac (p. 271). Huet was bishop of Avranches and not

of Soissons (p. 302). P. 313 read Chesterfield for Chersterfield. Vauvenargues' name was Luc de Clapiers and not de Clapier (p. 326). P. 330 for Grandisson read Grandison. Of the four possible dates for the publication of the *Neveu de Rameau*,¹ 1891 is the only one mentioned (p. 374); one of the earlier dates would be preferable. It is usual but entirely inaccurate to speak of Anatole France as an "ancien chartiste" (p. 627).

Perhaps the most serious objection to the book from a pedagogical standpoint is its length; it is considerably more extensive (664 pages) than most of the books intended for similar purposes. This difficulty can easily be surmounted by judicious omissions. Most of the increased bulk, moreover, is due to the illustrations and the extracts, which put but little burden upon the student. It may also be noted in this connection that the excellent arrangement of the book renders the consecutive reading of it much easier than in the case of many similar works. Upon the whole, the new history merits the heartiest commendation. Teachers who may not desire to use it as a text-book would do well to procure it for the sake of the illustrations as well as for personal use.

D. S. BLONDHEIM.

University of Illinois.

Vom Ursprung der provenzalischen Schriftsprache von HEINRICH MORF (Sitzungsberichte der königlich preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Classe, 1912, XLV, pp. 1014-1035).

Cette étude, dit M. Morf (p. 1035), pourrait s'intituler¹ "histoire d'un contre-sens." Le contre-sens est celui des provençalistes qui, sur

¹ Goethe's German translation, 1805; French retranslation of Goethe, 1821; first authentic French edition, 1823; publication of the text of an autograph manuscript, 1891.

² Ce titre permettrait aussi de croire que M. Morf traite, à l'occasion du provençal littéraire, le problème si complexe et si important de la formation des "langues communes": il n'en est rien.

la foi des *Razos de trobar* du Catalan Raimon Vidal (et sur la foi des *Leys d'Amors*), ont cru que le dialecte du Limousin est la source de la langue littéraire dont usent les troubadours. Or, après avoir rappelé l'opinion plus ou moins explicitement formulée d'une dizaine de savants modernes, M. Morf montre:

1. que le témoignage des *Leys d'amors*² ne vaut pas, puisqu'il est directement inspiré des *Razos*;

2. que, chez Raimon Vidal, "limousin" signifie non pas "dialecte du Limousin," mais "provençal," c'est-à-dire langue de tout le Midi de la France.

M. Morf suppose, en outre, que Raimon Vidal a choisi "limousin" en raison de la célébrité des troubadours limousins qui florissaient de son temps (en particulier Giraut de Bornelh).

Le texte des *Razos* ne permet point de douter que M. Morf ait raison: "Neguna parladura non es naturala ni drecha del nostre lengage mais acellà de Franza e de Lemozi, o³ de Proenza o d'Alvergna o de Caersin; per qe ieu vos dic que, quant ieu parlarai de Lemosy, que totas estas terras entendas et totas lor vezinas et totas cellas que son entre ellas."—Mais il est bien invraisemblable qu'un texte aussi clair ait pu si longtemps tromper tant de gens.⁴ M. Morf confond, ce me semble, deux choses bien distinctes: la question de l'origine limousine de la langue des troubadours et le sens de "limousin" chez Raimon Vidal. Or, même si Raimon Vidal et les *Leys d'Amors* n'existaient pas, le "provençal" des troubadours pourrait encore être du "limousin" très pur: c'est pourquoi la plupart des savants cités par M. Morf (Gaston

³ Et ceux de Terramagnino et de Jaufre de Foixà qui proviennent également de Raimon Vidal.

⁴ Texte d'Appel, *Provençalische Chrestomathie*, pp. 195-196. M. Morf écrit partout e (ms. B) au lieu de o (mss. CHL); il me semble que le contexte ne justifie e que pour *de Franza e de Lemozi*, puisque dans la suite Raimon Vidal ne distingue qu'entre la *parladura francesca* et *cella de Lemosin*. V., pour la légitimité de *Proenza* dans ce passage, *Annales du Midi*, I, p. 10, n.

⁵ M. Morf cite lui-même, p. 1022, n. 1. une phrase où Diez indique le contre-sens possible.